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CHAIR KAUFMAN: We're going to call this meeting of the Voting Modernization Board to order and ask -- Joan, are you calling roll this morning or is that Paula?

MS. RITTER: This is Paula.

MS. HACKELING: I'll let you.

MS. RITTER: I'll go ahead and do it.

MS. HACKELING: Thank you.

MS. RITTER: Stephen Kaufman?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Here.

MS. RITTER: June Lagmay?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Here.

MS. RITTER: And Gabriel Sandoval?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Present.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. We have a quorum. Thank you, everybody, for being flexible and getting this meeting rescheduled as soon as possible. So here we are on May 10th. And I will ask whether there are any members of the public wishing to comment on matters that are not on the current agenda? Do we have any? Do we have any public comment?

Okay, seeing or hearing none, let's go to item four on the agenda, which is the adoption of the February 9, 2022, actions and meeting minutes. I think we had some comments...
that were submitted previously, some amendments to those minutes.

   So with the changes that were requested and either made or to be made, do we have a motion to approve the action items and meeting minutes from the February 9 meeting?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: So moved.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Gabriel Sanchez [sic] moves.

I'm presuming --

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: My last name is Sandoval, not Sanchez.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Sorry. I got that wrong -- my apologies.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: June seconds.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: June seconds. All in favor? Aye.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Apologies, Gabriel.

Next, we have item five on the agenda, which is the Project Documentation Plan Review and Funding Award Proposals. We have two submissions that we're taking up today. The first one is Placer County, so let us hear from staff about those submissions.

And again, we appreciate, to the extent there are any county representatives, we appreciate you all being flexible. And I know that you were ready to go a couple weeks ago but
pleased that we could take up these issues here today.

So let us have the staff report on Placer County.

MS. HACKELING: Thank you. This is Placer County's Phase 3 Project Documentation Plan. Their project Phase 3 PDP package meets the requirements for completeness, pending submission of signed vendor agreements and invoices.

Just as background, Placer County proposed modernizing its voting system in three phases. In 2004, in Phase 1 of its strategy, the County was reimbursed by the Board for the purchase of Global AccuVote Optical scanning units, AccuFeed Ballot Feeder units, and GEMS Software from Diebold Elections Systems, which were fully implemented for the March 2002 Primary Election.

Then, in 2006, the County purchased a touch screen component to meet HAVA Title III voting system requirements.

In Phase 2 of its voting modernization strategy, the County was reimbursed for the purchase of an Agilis vote-by-mail sorting/scanning system, a Sentio ballot printing system, and AccuVote-OS memory cards from Dominion Voting Systems. The equipment was implemented for the November 2014 General Election.

Then, in 2020, the California Secretary of State notified all counties of its intent to withdraw certification and conditional approval of all California voting systems not
tested and certified to California Voting System Standards, which decertified the County’s legacy equipment. The County used funds in the state budget to purchase its current voting system, the Dominion Voting Systems Democracy Suite, which meets all current state and Election Assistance Commission requirements.

The County also purchased an Opex Rapid Ballot Extractor with grant monies to address a bottleneck in the processing of an increasing number of vote-by-mail ballots. The County has seen an increase in the number of registered voters in recent years. In addition, an increasing percentage of voters are opting to cast their votes by mail. At the November 2012 General Election, 67 percent of voters used vote-by-mail ballots. At the 2021 Gubernatorial Recall Election, 95 percent of voters voted by mail.

Voters are also returning their vote by mail ballots closer to Election Day. And as a result, the County has been challenged to process an increasing number of vote-by-mail ballots in a diminishing amount of time. The County has managed by increasing work hours and hiring additional temporary staff in an already cramped space.

In Phase 3 of its voting modernization strategy, the County requests funds to purchase a second Model 72 Rapid Extraction Desk Envelope Extractor. Given the dramatic increases in vote by mail ballots, a second unit is required.
for two very important reasons. The first is redundancy. The backup is of primary importance should the Opex Extractor stop working for even a small period of time. The second reason is that another unit would allow them to run the ballots coming off of the Agilis units on separate machines and allow for a greater throughput of ballot envelopes in a shorter window of time.

The County also requests funds to purchase a PowerVault NX3240 Storage Server. The storage appliance will be used to store election database and image backups. This appliance will act as a central repository for past election backups. These backups will include the entire election database and all ballot images.

Due to the increased storage requirements associated with the Dominion RTR, or Results to Report system, significantly increasing the storage capacity is essential to the long term storage of past and future election database backups.

The County’s estimated purchase date for these items is Fall 2022. Training and implementation are planned in order to allow for full functionality by March/April of 2023. Total project costs are $47,052.25. The County requests funds from the Voting Modernization Board in the amount of $35,289.19. The County will provide matching funds in the amount of $11,763.06.
It is our recommendation that Placer County’s Phase 3 Project Documentation Plan be conditionally approved pending signed vendor agreements, and a Conditional Funding Award Letter be issued in the amount of $35,289.19. Vendor quotes were provided for the requested items. The funds would be released upon the County’s submission of signed vendor agreements and invoices.

Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you, Joan. I have just one question on this, so I think we did this in our last round, too, so because they haven't yet actually purchased the equipment, this would be a conditional funding award letter; correct?

MS. HACKELING: Yes.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: With the information to be provided, essentially, after the fact?

MS. HACKELING: Correct.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Did any other members of the Board have questions of staff before I ask for comment from Placer County?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No questions.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: No questions.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Then do we have a representative of Placer County that wishes to speak this
MR. RONCO: Hi. Yes. This is Ryan Ronco, Placer County Clerk Recorder, Registrar of Voters. I don’t wish to speak, but I'm happy to speak. And, really, I have nothing prepared in advance of your discussion, I just -- we have appreciated the work that the VMB has done to this point trying to help us be able to prepare this documentation for you. It has actually been a challenge for us and we appreciate what Joan has been able to put together, giving us guidance along the way but I think it's a fairly easy package.

I think that the only hurdle that we know that we recognize is that we haven't purchased this equipment yet, so conditional approval would be very much appreciated in this instance. We are working with our county to, hopefully, move the purchase up a lot sooner, actually in this fiscal year rather than next fiscal year, due to some salary savings that we've been able to recognize this year. So hopefully we'll have some documentation to you actually earlier than the fall of this year.

But other than that, if you have questions of us, we're here to answer those.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you for that. And we are pleased that you were able to get another submission together here before the end of the line, so thank you for getting
that done. And I found it remarkable in the staff report to read that you all were at 95 percent mail-in balloting for the Gubernatorial Recall Election.

MR. RONCO: Yeah. It's -- we were at 82 percent permanent vote-by-mail before the change in the law. But I think that these last two election cycles, the November 2020 Presidential and the Gubernatorial Recall in 2021, allowed some more voters who had been resistant to vote-by-mail to see that the process works and it's safe and it's secure.

So I do think that it will be interesting to see what happens this election but certainly it's necessary for us to be able to increase in capacity there. Our big chokepoint was probably opening the envelopes. And one Opex is great and has been helpful but it goes down a little bit. And it, also, would be nice for us to be able to even have two going at the same time, so this is good.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, thank you.

June or Gabriel, do you have any questions for Mr. Ronco?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No, it's very straightforward. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: No questions. Thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Then with that, do we have a motion to approve Placer County's Project Documentation Plan and award them the amount recommended in the staff report?
BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I'll make the motion. I move that we, the Board, adopt staff recommendations regarding Placer County's Phase 3 funding in the amount of $35,289.19, conditioned upon submission of the signed vendor agreements.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Do we have a second?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. Why don't we just call the roll so that it's clear on the record for this?

MS. RITTER: Stephen Kaufman?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

MS. RITTER: June Awano Lagmay?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

MS. RITTER: And Gabriel Sandoval?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. Thank you all. And we will look forward to getting that approval letter out to you, Mr. Ronco. Thank you for appearing this morning.

MR. RONCO: Thank you so much. Appreciate it. Please give John Gardner from Solano County a harder time than you gave me because he's

CHAIR KAUFMAN: We're not trying --

MR. RONCO: -- (indiscernible).

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- we're not trying to make it difficult, folks.
MR. RONCO: All right. Oh, well, I'm just kidding.

Thank you so much, really important. We appreciate your efforts and thank you so much for this.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, thank you. Thanks for all your hard work.

All right, let us move on to Solano and we can put Mr. Gardner in the hotseat.

MS. HACKELING: Okay. I will also be presenting the Solano County staff report.

The Solano County Phase 3 Project Documentation Plan meets the requirements for completeness.

Again, as background, in 2005, in Phase 1 of its voting modernization strategy, the County was reimbursed by the Board for Elections Systems and Software optical scan ballot counter hardware and UNITY software.

In 2006, in Phase 2, the County was reimbursed for ES&S AutoMark Voter Assist Terminals, additional ballot scanners, a ballot on-demand printer, and UNITY software.

In 2015, the County modernized its Vote by Mail, or VBM, processing equipment with the purchase of a Bell & Howell sorter with non-VMB funds. This equipment scans all incoming VBM ballots.

The County has seen continued growth in the use of VBM. In the 2016 General Election, 46 percent of County voters voted in person at polling places. For the 2020
General Election, 11 percent of the County’s voters voted in person. For the Gubernatorial Recall Election, that number fell to 10 percent.

For Phase 3 of its voting modernization strategy, in order to handle the increasing volume of VBM ballots efficiently, the County is requesting reimbursement funds for the purchase of enhancements to its Fluence, formerly B&H, Elevate VBM sorter. The new hardware and software will allow for the implementation of future security improvements and to utilize higher speed connections. The new imaging hardware augments the tab detection cameras and lasers, which drive critical VBM sorting functions and image processing.

The County has not received prior funding related to the items requested in this PDP.

The County has provided signed vendor contracts for the items requested.

It is our recommendation that Solano County’s Phase 3 Project Documentation Plan be approved, and a Funding Award Letter be issued in the amount of $72,871.50.

Thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioners, do you have any questions of staff regarding their recommendation?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No questions.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: No questions.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Then with that, we'll put Mr. Gardner in the hotseat and allow him to make any comments, if you wish, in support of your funding request. I don't know, your request is about twice as much as Placer County's, so I don't know, you'll have to try twice as hard, I guess, but it seems fairly straightforward. But if there's anything you'd like to say in support of the request, you can have the floor.

MR. GARDNER: Sure. Well, thank you. I'm John Gardner. I'm the Assistant Registrar of Voters. Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. Thank you to Joan for all of her help in this.

Also here is Tim Flanagan. He is -- (clears throat) excuse me -- he is our Registrar of Voters for Solano County. And I have Austin Cliche. And Austin is the subject matter expert that really put all of this together for us.

But with our increase in vote-by-mail and the importance of really documenting what we do with our vote-by-mail incoming envelopes has been really important over the years and that continues to grow. So updating the system to modern technology, getting off of a Windows XP platform, moving to modern Windows 10, advanced cameras that have a higher, clearer picture of the envelopes when we need to document which voter sent what, as well as capturing the signatures for our election management system just becomes
increasingly important to the operation, both during the
election and after the election.

    If we're doing research to prove different things
that happened, we want to be able to go back to those
electronic images, the full image of the ballot, rather than
have to try to search through archived boxes. So that speeds
us up kind of in auditing our processes, as well as just the
day-to-day processing. But certainly the updates are -- will
be very helpful to our operation.

    Austin, did you want to add anything to that?

MR. CLICHE: No. Thank you very much for letting us
take the floor and for hearing our presentation today,
everyone.

    As John went ahead and said, with the increase that
we're going ahead and seeing in vote-by-mail, similar to
Placer, not quite to their level of return just yet, but in
2020, we were up to about ten percent only of our registered
voters turning out to polling locations. So with the
increases that we're seeing with vote-by-mail, these augments
will go ahead and assist us in keeping up with that process,
making sure that we have what we need for our backups, and
making sure that we're going through everything in a very
thorough and rapid approach so that we can go ahead and keep
up.

    Thank you.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you. I had just a question on what you said. How extensive are the polling places you are going to be providing for the June and November elections given the patterns? Are you on a vote center model or are you still doing individual polling places? I realize your population center isn't as huge as some of the other jurisdictions that we deal with. So how is that working on a going-forward basis?

MR. GARDNER: Well, we are still doing traditional polling place elections, so we have roughly 70 locations around the county. And we have kind of reduced some of those. And a lot of these polling places were located across the street from other locations, so we were able to, kind of cut that back down to one without greatly impacting voters that still wanted to vote in person, even though it's only about ten percent of the total turnout. But we also had some places that were barely seeing 100 voters all day long, so you have a lot of energy and resources sent out there to service barely 100 people casting ballots.

We are, though, seeing an increase in the number of people who are returning ballots on election day. So instead of taking advantage of the post office, we have increased the number of drop-off locations around the county for both 30 days and for the last five days before an election, kind of affording people a little easier access to just drop off that
ballot and return it to us versus showing up to vote in-
person on election day. That's typically our experience.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: And those are at separate locations
from the polling places?

MR. GARDNER: Correct. Yeah. We have 16, I believe,
is our number of drop-off locations, plus the 70 polling
places. And, of course, you would drop a ballot off at a
polling place. We're prepared for that, as well.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Great. Thank you.

June, do you have any questions for Solano County?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No, I do not.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Gabriel?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: I don’t have any questions.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Then, again, why don’t we --
if somebody wants to make a motion to approve the staff
recommendation for Solano County, that would be great.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: I move that the Board adopts
the recommendation from the staff that Solano County's Phase
3 Project Documentation Plan be approved and that a funding
award letter be issued in the amount of $72,871.50.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I second that motion.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. Paula, do you want to take
roll on the vote?

MS. RITTER: Sure. Stephen Kaufman?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.
MS. RITTER: June Awano Lagmay?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

MS. RITTER: And Gabriel Sandoval?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: There you go, Solano County. Congratulations. Use the money well. And we look forward to hearing good things from your elections this, well, I guess this summer and this fall.

MR. GARDNER: Thank you.

MR. CLICHE: Thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: All right. Now let's go to item six, which is a discussion about additional funding rounds. I'll note that for both of the counties that we just took up, each of them is leaving some money on the table, as have other counties. And so we do have additional funding that's still sitting in the kitty.

We appreciate that a number of counties responded to and stepped forward in response to the staff notifications about closing the books on this last round of funding. And now we need to figure out what to do going forward. And now the staff has prepared a series of recommendations for us on that, so why don't we hear the staff recommendations? And then we can discuss how to proceed with this issue.

MS. RITTER: Thank you. This is Paula and I'll be presenting the report on this.
So the Board just awarded Placer and Solano County's monies for the final funding round. And the final round of funding was based on amounts that were initially allocated back in 2002. And so now that those awards have been made, there's a remainder of $11.6-roughly million remaining in the fund. And at the last Board meeting on February 9th, the Board offered an additional funding round. And that opened up that $11.6 million to all the counties to come forward and submit an additional application to receive some of that funding.

And we received five applications -- or applications from five counties, totaling $4.2 million. And as we reviewed them, we realized that some of the pieces of equipment that they requested funding for were not allowable. And so our recommended allotment for the additional funding round is roughly $2.8 million, in round numbers, $800,000 to Los Angeles, $2,000 to Mono, $400,000 to San Joaquin, and $1.5 million to Santa Clara.

Some of the counties that submitted applications were not able to provide their board resolutions by the April 6th deadline for applications. And so we are recommending that the VMB grant an extension of time until May 25th of 2022 for the counties to submit their resolutions.

And with that being said, if those allotments are awarded, then the remaining funds will be $8.8 million.
That's unallocated funds remaining in the Voting
Modernization Fund.

So we considered some options for the Board as to how
we could dispose of those remaining funds and I will go over
them now.

The first option is to authorize another funding
round. And because there are other funding options available
to the counties that don’t have the same kind of restrictions
as Prop 41 funds, and they don’t require the same level of
documentation, there actually appears to be a lack of
interest in the counties for submitting applications to the
VMB. So if the Board were to approve this option, we would
recommend surveying the counties to gauge the level of
interest and participation that we can expect and to decide
what a workable timeframe would be prior to authorizing
another round.

If the Board wanted to go with this option, we could
survey the counties in July and present the results of that
survey at the August 24th Board meeting.

The second option we looked at was to extend the
deadline for the additional funding round. The applications
that we're looking at now from the five counties are for the
additional funding round and those were due on April 6th.
And we have received communications of interest from Fresno,
Placer, and Ventura in submitting applications if we were
able to extend the deadline. And, also, San Joaquin
expressed an interest in amending their application to
include some additional equipment.

So if the Board were to approve this option, we would
recommend the following timeline, and I've got it up here on
the screen for you. So the middle column on the table
liststhe existing dates for the meetings and deadlines.

And the right column would be what we're proposing
for an extension. So the application submission deadline
would be extended to July 6. And then those applications
could be reviewed at the August 24th Board meeting. And the
PDPs could be submitted by the September 21st meeting. That
would actually push the payment request deadline out until
March of 2023. I think with the original timeline we were
trying to wrap it up by the end of this year, so that would
push it out a little farther. I mean, obviously, these dates
are all up for change or whatever the Board wants to do with
regard to the dates.

We also wouldn’t want to penalize the counties that
did submit their applications on time. So we would recommend
that, for the counties who submitted applications for
allowable equipment, that we go ahead and approve those now.
And then any future applications that would be received under
this option would share in the remaining unallocated funds of
$8.8 million.
The third option that we looked at was closing the fund because these funds have been available since 2002, so for 20 years, and the request for applications for the additional funding round didn’t generate enough interest to use up all the money that is remaining. And, again, because of the aforementioned lack of interest from the counties, there are other funds that are easier to get, it seems fairly unlikely that there would be any significant request for VMB funding in the future.

If the Board were to consider this option, we would need to do some additional research and determine exactly how that would be accomplished. And we're proposing that staff could provide the results of that research at the August 24th Board meeting.

So those were the three options we considered. There are probably others but those are the ones that seemed likely.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: May I ask you, just so I'm clear, we've got -- so we've got those that submitted and you guys have done the review and there's about $2.8 million that can be approved based on what's in the door, so to speak. And then I'm trying to match up these things. So then there's this additional group, you mentioned at the beginning of the memo and then we kind of come back to it, and so there are five, just so I'm clear, there's five counties that actually
submitted requests but they didn’t have completed
applications, so that totals -- I'm sorry.

What's the amount that's on the table that could be
on the table for additional funding for counties that
expressed an interest but couldn’t get their Project
Documentation Plans in order in time for this meeting or by
the deadline that we're being asked to extend for?

MS. RITTER: We don’t have amounts for those.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay.

MS. LEAN: And the reason we don’t -- sorry, this is
Jana Lean. The reason we don’t is because they haven't
submitted their whole package, so we haven't reviewed it to
see what's acceptable and what we'd recommend for funding, so
that's the reason why we don’t have amounts set right now.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: So there's about $8.8 million that's
left. Can we safely assume that those counties that have
expressed an interest but haven't submitted, even if they got
the maximum amount potentially available, I don't know, would
they -- they would be within the $8.8 million?

MS. LEAN: Yes, sir. That's our estimate right now.

None of them have submitted anything or any kind of interest
that would amount to that amount of money

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah.

MS. LEAN: -- at this point.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: So it's fairly safe to say that if we
extended the deadlines for them, we wouldn’t have to worry about whether we're needing to kind of allocate, come up with some allocation formula, if we decided that we would kind of go with and allow for the submission by all counties that have expressed -- that have already expressed and interest and that have either submitted or said that they would submit?

    MS. LEAN: Based on the conversations that the staff has had, no, I don't believe that would be an issue.

    I do believe, with the extension, we may still have folks come forward. We may still have some money that would be remaining, so we are continuing to do research on what that means in the future, assuming that we have exhausted as much as we can with the counties, being able to submit plans for allowable expenses and what that would mean. So we're still in the process of doing that additional research right now.

    CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Yeah, I'm just a little -- I mean, I'll just throw it out to my fellow Board members. I don’t -- I guess I'm not adverse. I don’t have a problem with extending the deadline for those that have already shown a desire to submit and have responded to the -- to our outreach and giving them a small extension of time to submit. But then I'm worried about kind of we're continuing to just chase after that, just continuing to like chase down people
to try and use up whatever's left, and there's not even an
apparent interest in trying to get those funds.

So I don't know, I'll throw it open for discussion to
my fellow Commissioners.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: So this is June. I am
leaning with Stephen in allowing the small extension to May
25th for those counties that didn’t get their resolution in
time. That I would not have a problem with doing.

But I do have just a very quick point of information
to ask of staff.

Of the five that applied and the four that qualified
for funding, that is L.A., Mono, San Joaquin, and Santa
Clara, which of those did not yet provide their resolution
for which we are going to allow the extension to May 25th?

MS. RITTER: Unfortunately, I don’t remember off the
top of my head. I know Los Angeles needs to turn theirs in.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Okay.

MS. RITTER: And San Joaquin.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Thank you. Even if
that's just a rough guess, that's helpful.

So as best as you can recall, two of the four still
have to get their resolution in by May 25th?

MS. RITTER: Correct. It might be three. It might
be --

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: It might be three?
MS. RITTER: -- Santa Clara, as well, I'm not sure.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Oh, okay. All right.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I mean, if May 25th, which is coming up closely, is going to be an obstacle, we can certainly talk about moving that date a little. But at least there we're providing an extension for folks who have already shown a desire and have already presented information to support additional requests.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: How was the May 25th date selected?

MS. RITTER: It was basically an extension of a little over a month. And it fit within the guidelines of the existing timeline so that if we -- it wouldn’t prevent us from approving their PDPs at the June meeting.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: So it kind of kept it on a time track --

MS. RITTER: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: -- on the existing time track?

MS. RITTER: Yeah. That was the submission date on the existing track for the PDP submission, so it would allow them to submit their PDPs and their Board resolutions at the same time.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Not knowing whether they would have a Board meeting to approve those resolutions on
MS. RITTER: For the most part, most of the counties wouldn’t have a problem submitting it by May 25th.

MS. LEAN: I would suggest -- this is Jana. I would suggest moving it out at least a month or maybe a little bit more than a month if possible if you guys would consider that, only because they definitely will have to go to their board in order to certify the results of their election in July, so we know for sure they can get on the Board's agenda for that. It's just a suggestion.

And I can tell you that our staff, and staff is amazing, but we are now 28 days away from the election and counties are absolutely going full bore to prepare for the election. We're already in vote-by-mail voting right now, drop boxes opened today, so I know folks are quite busy. They will be busy this entire year, yes, but that might be something that you may want to consider because they have to submit stuff, our staff will need to take time to review it and make sure that these are allowable expenses, and then prepare the Project Documentation staff report, so it's just a thought.

I've just been thinking about the counties and our staff and your time. And I know that you guys are very busy folks and you're doing this out of the kindness of your heart, and you have for very many years and it's very much
appreciated, in order to disburse this, I still think much
needed funding mechanism for counties to have.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah. I mean, I'm not interested in
extending a deadline that makes it impossible for them to
meet, so I don’t think anybody is. But I'm also -- for the
same reasons you just stated, if we then kind of create new
rounds and new deadlines that are all going to be in the
middle of an election year, that’s going to become equally
unrealistic for them to be able to start, I think, preparing
new submissions and doing whatever they need to do in the
middle of another election cycle, so --

MS. LEAN: I would agree, sir. The one thing is, I
can tell you right now, they're also in the process of --
there's a lot of initiative petitions that are being turned
in right now and so they're doing signature verification, on
top of running the election. So I know that, Mr. Kaufman,
you are quite aware of a lot of that, and so are other folks,
but we are in heavy initiative time right now. And it will --
of course, the deadline is in June -- for those to be
approved to be on the ballots. But the signature
verification is going on right now for, I believe, six
initiatives and actively right now.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: May I make a suggestion?

Why don’t we take the recommendations of staff's report on
page four in bites, if we could vote on -- discuss and vote
on recommendations one and two first and get those out of the way? Because those are what's in front of us now as opposed to anything in the future, maybe we could approach it that way, in smaller bites?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I agree. I think that’s a good recommendation, so, all right, so let's get, let's get those out of the way.

So I think we've -- so does somebody -- want to make a motion on item number one with respect to the approval -- of the amounts that have been already submitted?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I'll move that the staff recommendation on approving the allotment of $2.779 million for the additional funding round, as described in the staff report dated May 10th, be approved.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Do I have a second?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Just for clarification, it's $2,779,343.97. I think, June, you had inadvertently said $279 million, so just to be clear.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Wow, not enough coffee.

Thank you, Gabriel.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: You're welcome.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: As amended.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Very important.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: As amended, you second?
BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: And I just want to be clear on this before we vote. So we are voting that the amount is allotted but we are still going to -- we are still going to have those Project Documentation Plans presented to us for approval at the subsequent -- at the June meeting as its currently calendared; correct?

MS. RITTER: That is correct.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: It's just putting it aside?

MS. RITTER: Correct.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. So let's take a vote on that.

MS. RITTER: Stephen Kaufman?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

MS. RITTER: June Awano Lagmay?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

MS. RITTER: Gabriel Sandoval?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Now, as I understand this decision point, some of the counties that make up that allotment that we just approved need an extension of time to be able to submit their -- basically, to complete their applications to get documentation from the counties to support their requests, which make up that $2.779 million
allocation; is that correct?

    MS. RITTER: That's correct.

    CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. And so what is the staff recommendation then if we want to provide the counties more time, given current circumstances, than the May 25th date. What is the date that you are recommending that we use that would be appropriate in light of everything that the counties are working on and having to do between now and the certification of the election results?

    MS. RITTER: Jana, did you have a suggested date in July?

    MS. LEAN: I do have suggested dates. So the certification for the election is July 7th. I would suggest you would do it at the end of the following week, July 15th.

    CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. So do we have a motion to approve an extension of time until June -- July, I'm sorry, did you say 15th?

    MS. LEAN: Yes, sir.

    CHAIR KAUFMAN: July 15th for the counties to complete their applications?

    BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Well, I'll move that the staff recommendation to approve an extension of time -- well, actually, it's the staff recommendation as amended by the Board with staff's concurrence to make the extension of time until July 15th for counties that did submit applications by
the deadline but have not yet submitted their governing board resolutions be approved.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. And again, before we vote on that, just for clarification, does it make sense then, and I'm asking this of staff, since there are some that are completed, some that aren't, and they're all going to be in a -- be under the umbrella of this additional funding round, does it make sense that the next meeting should be to approve all of these at once, in other words, rather than do a June meeting where two or three of these counties are approved and then a subsequent meeting where the others are approved or does that matter?

MS. LEAN: I would recommend that but I did not ask of staff, so sorry.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Well, I think it probably makes sense. We can, I guess, we can deal with that from a timing and scheduling standpoint at the end of this meeting, but all right.

Well, we have a motion on the table, and we have a second, so why don’t we take a vote on that?

MS. RITTER: Stephen Kaufman?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

MS. RITTER: June Awano Lagmay?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.
MS. RITTER: And Gabriel Sandoval?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, so now we've taken care of money that's been allocated in the second phase. So now the question is, basically: Should there be another phase or do we extend the deadline that we just kind of talked about in the context of counties that have applied and some who have applied but haven't completed their applications? (Sneezes.) Excuse me.

You know, I guess, again, in the theme of the goal has always been to get the money distributed and help the counties, it seems like there have been requests from, or at least indications from, a couple of counties that may have an interest in submitting yet again, but I don't know how much longer we keep extending deadlines and chasing counties until the well is totally dry to the penny.

So I guess I'll ask my fellow Commissioners if there's a will or desire to consider extending deadlines or maybe just creating yet a third round of funding instead of -- I guess it would be creating a third round of funding?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I'm of a like mind with the Chair that, for a period of 20 years, we're re-chopping the same trees. And staff has been exemplary in reaching out to counties for all the different funding rounds that have happened up to now, predating even my participation on this
So being that we have not been absolutely swarmed with interest in future rounds of funding, I am leaning toward closing the fund and allowing staff until August 24th to come up with recommendations on exact steps how to do that. But I would be interested in knowing how the other members feel, as well.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: I'm in agreement. It seems that, with the staff's guidance and assistance that, as June mentioned, has been exemplary, the counties have been the recipients of multiple opportunities to access this funding to address concerns related to voting and increased access, et cetera, over the years. And we are looking at a response that is not going to be indicative of the complete use of these funds based on the information we have.

So I think in reality we're going to be in a position where there are going to be funds, perhaps in the millions of dollars, left over. And so I agree with June and with Stephen that we should really look to see, what are the options to close out this particular funding pool in a way that makes sense and a way that, obviously, that is legal, so I would make that recommendation, as well.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, I'm hearing, I think, a consensus. I don’t think we're ever going to get this thing down to zero. And it seems like the counties have had and
continue to have other sources of funding that have satisfied their needs and, perhaps, have been less difficult for them to navigate in recent years than coming before our Board with the kind of limitations and restrictions that are built into the process. So, unless we hear otherwise from staff, it seems like we're not leaving any counties high and dry, even if we leave some money on the table.

So before we make a motion on this, are there any other -- is there any other input that staff wishes to provide on this issue?

Okay, then hearing none, do one of you want to make a motion, a motion with respect to moving towards closing the fund after the most recently approved allocation of funding is awarded?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Gabriel?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Sure. I'd like to move that the Board approve a motion requesting that the Secretary of State staff dealing with matters dealing with these funds provide some research and guidance and that the staff will be provided until August 24, 2022, to provide some recommendations as to the appropriate and recommended course of action to take with regard to these funds.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: May I make a friendly amendment that we be very clear that the recommendation 3-C as written recommends that the Board vote to close the fund
and, in addition, have staff report back on August 24th on how to conduct this be adopted so that it's clear that the action we're taking today is actually closing the fund, and then waiting for the staff to advise us how best to implement that?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Yes, with that friendly amendment.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: And can the person recording this clearly decipher that motion? It's essentially a motion to adopt the language in the summary report provided by the staff at 3-C.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Precisely.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Correct? Okay. Okay, so we have a motion, we have a second. Let's take a vote on that.

MS. RITTER: Stephen Kaufman?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

MS. RITTER: June Awano Lagmay?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

MS. RITTER: Gabriel Sandoval?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, so --

MS. RITTER: May I ask --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Sorry.

MS. RITTER: I'm sorry. May I ask a question?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Sure.
MS. RITTER: We've agreed to extend the deadline for counties to submit their governing board resolutions to July 15th, and so I think we need to then extend the deadlines for their PDP submission and review. I think you were talking about that earlier, so I just wanted to make sure that I understand what those new dates are.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Okay.

MS. RITTER: So the existing PDP submission deadline was May 25th. So are we suggesting that we extend that to July 15th?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I think so, yes.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Yes.

MS. RITTER: Okay. And in that case, then, we would review those at the August 24th Board meeting?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: That makes sense.

MS. RITTER: Okay. So in that case, we no longer need to have the June Board meeting?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I don’t think so. I don’t think there's any business we need to conduct. Unless there's any urgency for the ones that have been submitted that are ready to go, I would think we should just take them all up together as a collective additional funding round on August -- in August.

Jana --

MS. RITTER: Thank you.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- is there any reason why we wouldn’t want to proceed that way?

MS. LEAN: No, sir. I think that’s a good idea.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I’m fine with that.

MS. RITTER: Thank you for confirming. Do we need to take a vote on that?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Did we adopt those dates in a motion?

I think we did.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: No?

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: This is, I think, administrative business. I don’t think it requires Board approval.

And to answer your questions, Stephen, no, we didn’t.

MS. LEAN: So July 15th, I believe that is in the motion --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah.

MS. LEAN: -- those funded to July 15th. But all of these internal logistical deadlines, no, I think we can deal with that, Paula, and we'll just --

MS. RITTER: Okay.

MS. LEAN: -- like make sure that it's out there for folks to understand. And I'll make sure to keep the Board members informed on what's going on.

MS. RITTER: Thank you for that clarification.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Great. Thank you all for working through that. Do we have any other business to discuss?

MS. LEAN: I want to give some historical feedback and just so folks know that June 6th was the very first meeting. June 6th of 2002 was the first Voting Modernization Board meeting.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Oh, my gosh. That's not historical, that's hysterical.

MS. LEAN: And I know I was present because I was Staff Consultant to the Board back then. And I know Stephen Kaufman, you were here, I believe --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I think I was --


CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- I think I was not there for the first -- I don't know. I joined a little after the initial Board meetings.

MS. LEAN: Okay. Well, I know I've worked with you now for --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: But suffice it to say, I've been around long enough.

MS. LEAN: It's a worthy effort --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: (Indiscernible.)

MS. LEAN: -- 20 years, so that's a long time. This has been an amazing, amazing project. And it's always great
to so many staff to learn about it. And I get asked
questions and I'm like, oh gosh, let me think back because
that's a long time ago.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Thank you, Jana.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, we've done good work. The
intentions were good. The execution has been good. We've
had a few ups and downs and circumstances that changed
dramatically since that initial meeting. But I'm pleased to
see that we've done our best throughout to give this money
away and help the counties move in the right direction. And
I think there's a reason why California is a model for the
rest of the country in terms of how elections are run. And
I'd like to think that we've played some small part in making
that happen.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Here–here.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, thank you for that historic and
hysterical perspective, Jana.

And with that, we're going to -- I am going to take a
motion to adjourn this meeting.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: So moved.

BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I move for adjournment of
the meeting.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Gabriel seconds. All in favor, say
aye? Aye.
BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Our meeting is adjourned.

(Thereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 10:59 a.m.)